

REMARKS

Information Disclosure Statement

To address the issues raised in the action with regard to references AZ, AAA, and ALL in applicant's information disclosure statement, we file herewith a supplemental information disclosure statement including a copy of missing reference ALL and English-language abstracts for references AZ and AAA. We ask that the Examiner initial the references in the Form PTO-1449 enclosed therein and return a copy to us with his next communication.

Claim Objections

We believe that the claim amendments above address each of the claim objections raised in the action.

Section 112 Rejections

We have amended claims 2, 5, and 38 to delete the allegedly offending terms "substantially" and "comparable."

Prior Art Rejections

There are only three independent claims pending, claims 1, 37, and 38, all of which stand rejected as anticipated by Ueyanagi et al. European Patent Application EP 0,944,049 (hereinafter "Ueyanagi"). We traverse.

With respect to claim 1, we can find nothing in Ueyanagi to teach or suggest "at least one optic positioned relative to the mask to form an optical cavity with the mask" as required by the claim (emphasis added). Indeed, while the action points to condense lens 5 and/or spherical incident surface 6a of transparent condensing medium 6 in FIG. 15 of Ueyanagi as providing the claimed "at least one optic" (Paragraph 2 of action), it fails to point to any section of Ueyanagi to indicate how or why such optics form the claimed optical cavity.

Moreover, we can find nothing in Ueyanagi to teach or suggest "a source providing electromagnetic radiation to the optical cavity to resonantly excite a mode supported by the optical cavity" as further required by claim 1 (emphasis added). Indeed, while the action points

to semiconductor laser 2 in Ueyanagi as the claimed source, it fails to point to any section of Ueyanagi to indicate that the laser resonantly excites a mode supported by the optical cavity.

Such omissions are not remedied by the action's reliance on Paragraph 39 of Ueyanagi, which simply indicates that light formed on condense surface 6b following refraction by spherical incident surface 6a leaks a near field wave 10 through small aperture 7a. We can see no basis in the paragraph for concluding that the Ueyanagi provides the claimed optical cavity or the claimed resonant excitation.

Similarly, with respect to independent claim 38, we can find nothing in Ueyanagi, nor does the action point to a section of Ueyanagi, to teach or suggest "at least one optic positioned relative to the mask to form a[n] ... optical cavity," let alone "a stable optical cavity," as required by the claim (emphasis added).

Similarly, with respect to independent claim 39, we can find nothing in Ueyanagi, nor does the action point to a section of Ueyanagi, to teach or suggest "resonantly exciting a mode of a stable optical cavity; and coupling electromagnetic radiation out of the optical cavity ... through an array of apertures in one of multiple optics that define the optical cavity" as required by the claim (emphasis added).

Therefore, we submit that the independent claims are allowable over the cited prior art. Accordingly, we ask the Examiner to withdraw the rejection. If not, we ask the Examiner to point to specific sections in the cited prior art for finding all of the limitations in the claims being rejected.

With respect to the remaining dependent claims, we submit that they are allowable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as those set forth above in connection with the independent claims.